

REMARKS

Claims 18-27 and 29-38 are now pending in the application, with claim 18 being the only independent claim. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that claims 21-23 recite allowable subject matter and would be allowed if rewritten into independent form to include the limitations of the underlying base claim. Such an amendment has not been made because, for the reasons set forth below, Applicant believes that the other pending claims also should be allowed over the applied art.

In the Office Action, claims 18-36 have been provisionally rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-20 of co-pending patent application Serial No. 10/289,896 (the ‘896 application). Specifically, the Office Action asserts that the limitations of the presently pending claims 18-36 are encompassed by the limitations of claims 1-20 of the ‘896 application.

In response, it is noted that each of the presently pending claims recites the feature that a central hub, which maintains and distributes contact information, implements procedures to preclude mass downloading of contact information. At least this feature of the present claims is neither recited nor suggested in any of the claims of the ‘896 application. Accordingly, withdrawal of this provisional rejection is respectfully requested.

At the same time, it is noted that some of the other presently claimed features are in fact similar or identical to features claimed in the ‘896 application (which application currently is under final rejection). Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to carefully review the cited prior art and the positions taken by the examiner in the ‘896 application, in order to

determine whether any of such prior art or positions might be applicable to the present application.

Claims 18-20, 24-30 and 36 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) over U.S. Patent Publication No. 20020156895 (Brown) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030061307 (Daswani); claim 31 has been rejected under § 103(a) over Brown in view of Daswani and U.S. Patent 6,865,384 (Sagi); claim 32 has been rejected under § 103(a) over Brown in view of Daswani and U.S. Patent 6,760,728 (Osborn); and claims 33-35 have been rejected under § 103(a) over Brown in view of Daswani and U.S. Patent Publication No. 20020016857 (Harari). Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

The present invention pertains to systems for sharing contact information in which a central hub maintains and electronically distributes contact information, while also implementing procedures to preclude mass downloading of contact information. As a result, in representative embodiments, a system according to the present invention can be accessible by large numbers of unrelated individuals (e.g., the general public), allowing end users (recipients) to download contact information for a desired contact into terminals operated by the end users.

Such a system, e.g., often can eliminate the need for end users to manually type or otherwise enter large amounts of contact information before it can be easily accessible on their electronic devices. At the same time, the central hub that maintains the contact information implements procedures to preclude mass downloading of contact information, thereby inhibiting the ability of mass marketers and others with ulterior motives to abuse the otherwise easy availability of such information.

Thus, independent claim 18 is directed to a system for sharing contact information, which includes: a central hub that maintains and distributes contact information, multiple terminals that

electronically communicate with the central hub, and multiple contacts, each such contact having an associated contact record that is maintained by the central hub. Upon receipt of a contact-record request from one of the terminals, the central hub automatically transmits a matching contact record to the requesting terminal. Each of the terminals, in turn, has an ability to retrieve any of the contact records maintained by the central hub for the contacts, but the central hub implements procedures to preclude mass downloading of contact information.

The foregoing commendation of features is not disclosed or suggested by the applied art. For example, no permissible combination of Brown and Daswani would have disclosed or suggested at least the feature of a central hub, which maintains and electronically distributes contact information, implementing procedures to preclude mass downloading of contact information.

In this regard, Brown concerns a particular system and method for sharing contact information. However, as acknowledged in the Office Action, Brown does not say anything at all about a central hub implementing procedures to preclude mass downloading of contact information.

To make up for this deficiency, the Office Action cites Daswani (specifically referencing pages 1-2, paragraph [0011] of Daswani). In particular, the Office Action asserts that the presently recited procedures to preclude mass downloading can be read on Daswani's comments on the limited download data sizes, speed of connection, and download time and type of data content that may be received by certain portable Internet appliances.

In response, it is noted that these passing references in Daswani simply refer to limitations that are inherent in certain kinds of portable devices used to access the Internet. Daswani's comments have nothing at all to do with procedures implemented at any kind of

central hub, much less anything similar to the presently recited procedures implemented by a central hub that maintains and distributes contact information.

Beyond the specific portion of Daswani, the entire disclosure of Daswani has been reviewed in detail and is not seen to say anything at all about implementing any kind of procedures to preclude mass downloading of contact information. Rather, Daswani only appears to discuss routing information retrieved over the Internet to various locations within a portable electronic device, such as a PDA. Daswani does not make any further mention in relation to its passing reference to certain inherent limitations of portable Internet appliances.

Because neither Brown nor Daswani says anything about this aspect of the invention, no permissible combination of these two references could have rendered independent claim 18 obvious. The other cited prior-art references also have been studied and are not seen to provide any such disclosure.

Accordingly, independent claim 18 is believed to be allowable over the applied art.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from the independent claims discussed above, and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also defines an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

New claim 37 depends from independent claim 18 and recites the additional feature that the contact-record request is generated by entering information into fields of the user interface, and, upon receipt of the matching contact record, additional fields in the user interface automatically are filled in. This feature is supported, e.g., at Figure 10; at page 28 line 11 through page 29 line 33; and at page 47 lines 11-20 of the Specification and, particularly in

combination with the features recited in independent claim 18 (from which it depends), is not believed to be disclosed or suggested by the applied art.

New claim 38 depends from independent claim 18 and recites the additional feature that the contact records maintained by the central hub are accessible by members of the general public. This feature is supported, e.g., at page 11 lines 22-24; at page 55 lines 12-14; and at page 56 lines 1-5 of the Specification and, particularly in combination with the features recited in independent claim 18 (from which it depends), is not believed to be disclosed or suggested by the applied art.

In order to sufficiently distinguish Applicant's invention from the applied art, the foregoing remarks emphasize several of the differences between the applied art and Applicant's invention. However, no attempt has been made to categorize each novel and unobvious difference. Applicant's invention comprises all of the elements and all of the interrelationships between those elements recited in the claims. It is believed that for each claim the combination of such elements and interrelationships is not disclosed, taught or suggested by the applied art. It is therefore believed that all claims in the application are fully in condition for allowance, and an indication to that effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of the currently submitted papers that have not been accounted for in this paper or the accompanying papers, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 502490. If an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is required for the filing of the currently submitted papers and is not accounted for in this paper or the accompanying papers, such an extension is requested and the fee (or any underpayment thereof) should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Dated: August 29, 2007

Respectfully submitted,
JOSEPH G. SWAN, P.C.

JOSEPH G. SWAN,
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
1334 Parkview Avenue , Suite 100
Manhattan Beach, California 90266
Telephone: (310) 372-8624
Facsimile: (310) 356-3845

By _____ /Joseph G. Swan/
Joseph G. Swan
Registration No. 41,338